

it really didn't get the job done. The constitutional amendment obviously is the preferred route and that has been adopted but, nevertheless, it seems to me in the committee hearing there was some talk about a less onerous effort to try to keep track of corporations that are farming and the farmland that they have and where it is located, and that there would be a way to implement what 587 and the statutes it would repeal now takes care of, and would deal with the concerns of Senator DeCamp. And so repealing this outright without looking at some other way of identifying corporate ownership in the State of Nebraska seems to me unwise, that you are moving rather hastily. It is a reaction to the constitutional amendment. It is a negative reaction and I understand that, but at the same time, I don't see any reason why we have to pass this bill. I think Senator Newell is right in raising some questions. Rather I would like to see the committee work with those who are concerned about corporate farming, work with them in finding an easier way to identifying corporate farmholdings in the state, and leave it at that, and I don't think you need the legislation. I think that we ought to just kill the bill or at least not pass it and take a look at it over the interim and come back next year with a form reporting mechanism that isn't as onerous to Senator DeCamp and others and in fact finds the information out that they are looking for.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Newell, you are not closing.

SENATOR NEWELL: No. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I appreciate the DeCamp explanation and I do appreciate that there is much about this reporting form and its uses that I am not fully aware of. I was not attending the public hearing so I am somewhat unfamiliar. I do think Senator Wesely made some good points and I am just curious if the introducers of the bill paid much attention to those points. One of the questions I am wondering is there going to be a replacement for this kind of legislation so that we can have some way, some enabling legislation to deal with the whole question of Initiative 300? Are we going to be able to keep some sort of reporting requirements so we do carry out the intent of what the people demanded this fall in terms of those reporting requirements and just what exactly we are about to accomplish or whether we are going to try to circumvent that constitutional amendment? So I am not sure whether or not this bill ought to be killed. We are not as convinced as maybe I thought I was but I do believe that I need to have some additional conversations about whether or not we are going to carry out or try to deal with the results of Initiative 300 and any reporting